## REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

## I. Amendments to the Claims

Independent claim 1 has been amended to clarify features of the invention recited therein and to further distinguish the present invention from the reference relied upon in the rejection discussed below.

## II. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1, 10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Plourde, Jr. et al. (U.S. 7,281,839) and LaJoie et al. (U.S. 5,850,218). Further, dependent claims 2-6, 9, 11 and 13-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of Plourde, LaJoie, Beach (U.S. 2004/0013409), Young et al. (U.S. 6,498,895), Akamatsu et al. (U.S. 7,224,886), Hanai et al. (U.S. 7,134,136) and Kobb (U.S. 7,356,246). These rejections are believed clearly inapplicable to amended independent claim 1 and claims 2-6 and 9-21 that depend therefrom for the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 1 recites an apparatus including a reception means for receiving, as information indicating preprogrammed recording settings, a date of distribution, a time of distribution, and a distribution source of distributed information. In addition, claim 1 recites displaying means for incorporating the received information indicating the preprogrammed recording settings into a two-dimensional matrix defined by the date of

distribution and the time of distribution, the two-dimensional matrix having a plurality of divided areas, each divided area of the plurality of divided areas having a respective date of distribution assigned thereto, such that each divided area of the plurality of divided areas represents the respective date of distribution assigned thereto, and for displaying a display screen indicating the two-dimensional matrix having the information indicating the preprogrammed recording settings incorporated therein. Finally, claim 1 recites that, when a plurality of pieces of the information indicating the preprogrammed recording settings are incorporated into the two-dimensional matrix, the plurality of pieces of the information indicating the preprogrammed recording settings are respectively incorporated into the plurality of divided areas of the two-dimensional matrix based on the respective date of distribution represented by each respective divided area of the plurality of divided areas and indicated by a respective piece of the information indicating the preprogrammed recording settings. Plourde and LaJoie, or any combination thereof fails to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned distinguishing features, as required by independent claim 1.

Initially, please note that the above-described 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection acknowledges that Plourde fails to disclose or suggest the features required by the displaying means, as recited in previously presented claim 1. In light of the above, the present rejection relies on LaJoie for teaching the above-mentioned features that are admittedly lacking from Plourde. However, in view of the above-identified amendments to claim 1, which clarify the operation of the claimed displaying means, it is submitted that LaJoie fails to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned distinguishing features now required by the displaying means, as now recited in claim 1.

Rather, LaJoie merely teaches displaying a list of timers 325 of a specific type 324, a day

326, a date 330, a time 332, a channel number 334 and a channel call sign 336, such that after the list is displayed, the user will have the option to review and modify each of the timers and then accept any changes made to the timers (see Fig. 14, and col. 22, lines 46-53). Specifically, LaJoie teaches that each timer individually identifies the day, time and channel for which the timer is set (see Fig. 14, and col. 22, lines 46-53).

Thus, in view of the above, it is clear that LaJoie merely teaches that each set timer individually identifies the day, time and channel for which the timer is set, but fails to disclose or suggest incorporating the received information indicating the preprogrammed recording settings into a two-dimensional matrix defined by the date of distribution and the time of distribution, the two-dimensional matrix having a plurality of divided areas, each divided area of the plurality of divided areas having a respective date of distribution assigned thereto, such that each divided area of the plurality of divided areas represents the respective date of distribution assigned thereto, and such that when a plurality of pieces of the information indicating the preprogrammed recording settings are incorporated into the two-dimensional matrix, the plurality of pieces of the information indicating the preprogrammed recording settings are respectively incorporated into the plurality of divided areas of the two-dimensional matrix based on the respective date of distribution represented by each respective divided area of the plurality of divided areas and indicated by a respective piece of the information indicating the preprogrammed recording settings, as recited in claim 1.

In other words, LaJoie merely teaches that for each scheduled recording a table displays on a single line a day, a date, a time, and a channel (see Fig. 14), but fails to disclose or suggest the two-dimensional matrix defined by the date of distribution and the time of distribution, the

two-dimensional matrix having a plurality of divided areas, each divided area of the plurality of divided areas having a respective date of distribution assigned thereto, such that each divided area of the plurality of divided areas represents the respective date of distribution assigned thereto, as required by claim 1.

Applicants note that the structure required by the claimed two-dimensional matrix (see for exemplary purposes only, the structure of the two-dimensional matrix illustrated in Fig. 2 of the present application) will allow a user to recognize preprogrammed recording settings at a glance and to quickly and easily recognize whether or not redundant preprogramming exists. On the other hand, the structure of the table 325 disclosed by LaJoie does not provide the benefit of the structure required by claim 1, because the invention of LaJoie does not allow a user to recognize preprogrammed recording settings at a glance and to quickly and easily recognize whether or not redundant preprogramming exists.

In other words, referring to claim 1, since (i) each piece of information indicating the preprogrammed recording settings identifies a respective date of distribution and a respective time of distribution, (ii) the two-dimensional matrix is defined by a date of distribution and includes a time of distribution, such that the two-dimensional matrix has a plurality of divided areas, and each divided area of the plurality of divided areas has a respective date of distribution assigned thereto, such that each divided area of the plurality of divided areas represents the respective date of distribution assigned thereto, and (iii) the two-dimensional matrix incorporates each piece of information indicating the preprogrammed recording settings based on a respective date of distribution, the invention of claim 1 requires a structure that, based on the two-dimensional matrix, the user has the ability to easily determine whether or not the plurality of

pieces of the information indicating preprogrammed recording settings are redundant (see for example, but not limited to, Fig. 2).

On the other hand, as mentioned above, LaJoie merely teaches that for each scheduled recording a table displays on a single line a day, a date, a time, and a channel.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that independent claim 1 and claims 2-6 and 9-21 that depend therefrom would not have been obvious or result from any combination of Plourde and LaJoie.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Plourde and/or LaJoie or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Plourde and/or LaJoie to obtain the invention of independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 and claims 2-6 and 9-21 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

Regarding dependent claims 2-6, 9, 11 and 13-21, which were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Plourde and LaJoie in view of various combinations of Beach, Young, Akamatsu, Hanai and Kobb (secondary references), it is submitted that the secondary references do not disclose or suggest the above-discussed features of independent claim 1 which are lacking from the Plourde nad LaJoie references. Therefore, no obvious combination of Plourde and LaJoie with any of the secondary references would result in, or otherwise render obvious, the invention recited independent claim 1 and claims 2-6 and 9-21 that depend therefrom.

## III. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Hiroyuki KONDO et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/
2009.05.04 15:21:55 -04'00'

By:_____

Andrew L. Dunlap
Registration No. 60,554
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
May 4, 2009